

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**FREDERICK H. GRIBBELL, LLC**
10250 ALLIANCE ROAD, SUITE 120
CINCINNATI, OHIO 45242
FAX COVER SHEET

OCT 14 2005

TOTAL NUMBER OF PAGES INCLUDING THIS SHEET: 4TO: U.S. Patent & Trademark Office - Group Art Unit 2878FAX NO.: 571/273-8300

FROM: Frederick H. Gribbell ----- TELEPHONE NO.: (513) 891-2100 or (513) 598-8084

DATE: 10-14-2005 Serial No. 10/695,673CONFIRMING COPY: ☐ WILL FOLLOW; ☒ WILL NOT FOLLOW

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FAX IS INTENDED FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL TO WHOM IT IS ADDRESSED AND MAY CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT IS PRIVILEGED, CONFIDENTIAL, ATTORNEYS' WORK PRODUCT AND/OR EXEMPT FROM DISCLOSURE UNDER APPLICABLE LAW. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT (OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE TO DELIVER IT TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT), YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE NOTIFY US BY COLLECT TELEPHONE.

SHOULD YOU HAVE ANY PROBLEMS RECEIVING THIS TRANSMISSION (OR HAVE INCORRECTLY RECEIVED THIS TRANSMISSION), PLEASE CALL (513) 891-2100 or (513) 598-8084.

ORIGINATING FAX NUMBER: (513) 598-8084

COMMENTS/MESSAGE

OCT 14 2005

PATENT**IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE**

Applicant: DuWain K. Ake : Art Unit: 2878
Serial No.: 10/695,673 : Examiner: David Porta
Filed: October 29, 2003
For: **MODULATED LASER LIGHT DETECTOR**

**RESPONSE TO RESTRICTION AND
ELECTION OF CLAIMS REQUIREMENTS**

Mail Stop Non-Fee Amendment
COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
PO Box 1450
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

Dear Sir:

In an Office Action mailed on September 22, 2005, the Examiner has imposed a restriction requirement as between a first group of claims (1-15) and a second group of claims (16-20) of the above-referenced patent application. The Examiner also has stated that the claims of Group I are directed to a "modulated laser light detector" whereas the claims of Group II are directed to a "synchronous rectifier circuit."

REMARKS

The Examiner has taken the position that these two groups of claims are for distinct inventions, and thus should be in separate patent applications. Applicants are now required to make an election as to which group of claims are to be substantively examined in the instant application.

Serial No.: 10/695,673

-1-

Attorney Docket: APAC-515